**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GOPALA KRISHNA TAMADA**

**WRIT PETITION No.19003 of 1998**

**Dated : 09.04.2007**

**Between:**

Rayala Sangaiah S/o Kotaiah and others

… **PETITIONERS**

**And:**

Assistant Commissioner of Labour,
Khammam, Khammam District and others.

….**RESPONDENTS**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GOPALA KRISHNA TAMADA**

**WRIT PETITION No.19003 of 1998**

**ORDER:**

This writ petition is filed seeking a Writ of Certiorari to quash the order of the first respondent dated 06.12.1997 as illegal, arbitrary, perverse and violated by errors apparent on record.

The facts, in brief, are that respondents 2 to 11 filed applications before the first respondent-Authority under Minimum Wages Act and Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Khammam, alleging that they attended to various agricultural operations in the fields of the petitioners for the period from 20th July, 1992 to 29th July, 1993, but the petitioners paid less wages than the minimum wages notified by the Government, and thereby they sought a direction to the petitioners to pay the difference of minimum wages for the said period. The petitioners also filed counters denying the allegations made against them. Thereafter, after conducting enquiry, the first respondent passed

an order, dated 06.12.1997, allowing the claim of respondents 2 to 11 only from April 1993 onwards holding that they failed to show any reason for not preferring the claim before April 1993, and thereby directed the petitioners to deposit the difference of minimum wages payable to respondents 2 to 11 by way of demand drafts within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the said order.

Now the grievance of the petitioners is that though they did not engage respondents 2 to 11 continuously during the period claimed by them, the first respondent, without considering the evidence adduced by them, ordered to pay the difference of minimum wages. Hence, this writ petition.

Despite service of notice, the respondents have not chosen to file any counter.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Labour.

No doubt, learned counsel for the petitioners raised various contentions, but this Court is unable to appreciate the same. Having perused the order impugned in this writ petition, this Court is of the view that the first respondent has, in fact, restricted the claim of respondents 2 to 11 only for a period of six months, though they claimed for a period of one year. Hence, this Court sees no error in the order impugned in this writ petition.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

09.04.2007

sh